## MASx52: Assignment 2

Solutions and discussion are written in blue. A sample mark scheme, with a total of 25 marks, is given in red, with each mark placed after the statement/deduction for which the mark would be given. As usual, mathematically correct solutions that follow a different method would be marked analogously.

1. Let  $(X_n)$  be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, each with a uniform distribution on [-1,1]. Define

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i,$$

where  $S_0 = 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ .

- (a) Show that  $S_n$  is a martingale, with respect to the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .
- (b) Find  $\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_2]$  in terms of  $X_2$  and  $X_1$ , and hence show that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 \,|\, \mathcal{F}_2] = S_2^2 + \frac{1}{3}.$$

(c) Write down a deterministic function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$M_n = S_n^2 - f(n)$$

is a martingale (justification is not required).

Solution.

(a) Since  $X_i \in \sigma(X_i)$  we have  $X_i \in \sigma \mathcal{F}_n$  for all  $i \leq n$  [1]. Hence, since sums of  $\mathcal{F}_n$  measurable functions are measurable, we have also that  $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$  [1]. Since  $|X_i| \leq 1$  for all i, we have

$$|S_n| \le |X_1| + |X_2| + \ldots + |X_n| \le n.$$

Thus  $S_n$  is a bounded random variable and hence  $S_n \in L^1$ . [1] Lastly,

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} + S_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[S_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1}] + S_n$$

$$= S_n.$$

[1] Here, we use the linearity of conditional expectation to deduce the second line, followed by using that  $X_{n+1}$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$  [1] and  $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$  to deduce the third line [1]. The final line follows because  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$  for all i. Hence  $S_n$  is a martingale. Pitfall: You should justify your use of the rules of conditional expectation.

(b) We have

$$S_n^3 = (X_1 + X_2 + X_3)^2 = X_1^2 + X_2^2 + X_3^2 + 2X_1X_2 + 2X_2X_3 + 2X_1X_3.$$

[1] Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[S_3^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_2] = \mathbb{E}[X_1^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[X_2^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_2] + \mathbb{E}[X_3^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_2]$$

$$+ 2\mathbb{E}[X_1X_2 \mid \mathcal{F}_2] + 2\mathbb{E}[X_2X_3 \mid \mathcal{F}_2] + 2\mathbb{E}[X_1X_3 \mid \mathcal{F}_2]$$

$$= X_1^2 + X_2^2 + \mathbb{E}[X_3^2] + 2X_1X_2 + 2X_2\mathbb{E}[X_3] + 2X_1\mathbb{E}[X_3]$$

$$= (X_1 + X_2)^2 + \frac{1}{3}$$

$$= S_2^2 + \frac{1}{3}.$$

[1]. Here, in the first line we use linearity of conditional expectation. To deduce the second line we use that  $X_3$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_2$  [1], and that  $X_1, X_2 \in m\mathcal{F}_2$  to 'take out what is known'[1]. We then use that

$$\mathbb{E}[X_3^2] = \int_{-1}^1 x^2 \frac{1}{2} \, dx = \frac{1}{3}$$

to deduce the final lines [1].

Pitfall:  $X_n$  has the continuous uniform distribution on the interval [-1,1].

(c) In view of (b), we take  $f(n) = \frac{n}{3}$ , so that  $M_n = S_n - \frac{n}{3}$  [2].

To make this guess: note from (b) that  $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2]$  drifts upwards by  $\frac{1}{3}$  on each time step, so  $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2 - \frac{n}{3}]$  stays constant. This is the only way to compensate for the drift in the form  $S_n - f(n)$ , and (possibly) obtain a martingale.

To see that  $M_n$  really is a martingale: Since  $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$  we have  $M_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ , and  $|M_n| \leq |S_n^2| + \frac{2n}{3} \leq n^2 + \frac{n}{3}$  so  $M_n \in L^1$ . A similar calculation to (b) then shows that  $\mathbb{E}[S_{n+1}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = S_n^2 + \frac{1}{3}$ , hence  $\mathbb{E}[M_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = M_n$ .

2. Consider the one-period market with  $r = \frac{1}{10}$ , s = 2,  $d = \frac{1}{2}$  and u = 3, in our usual notation. A contract specifies that

The holder of the contract will sell 2 units of stock, and be paid K units of cash, at time 1.

(a) Explain briefly why the contingent claim of this contract is

$$\Phi(S_1) = K - 2S_1$$
.

- (b) Find a replicating portfolio h for this contingent claim.
- (c) Write down the value  $V_0^h$  of h at time 0.
- (d) Find the numerical values of risk-neutral probabilities

$$q_u = \frac{(1+r)-d}{u-d}$$
 and  $q_d = \frac{u-(1+r)}{u-d}$ .

2

Hence, show that  $\frac{1}{1+r}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Phi(S_1)] = V_0^h$ .

(e) For which K does the contract have value zero at time 0?

Solution.

(a) The holder will be paid K units of cash, resulting in a gain of K, and give away 2 units of stock, each of which is worth  $S_1$ , resulting in a loss of  $2S_1$ . [1] Hence

$$\Phi(S_1) = K - 2S_1.$$

Pitfall: This is not a European put option. The holder of this contract must pay K units of cash and be given 2 stock.

(b) The possible values taken by  $S_1$  are su=6 and sd=1. A replicating portfolio h=(x,y) must satisfy  $V_1^h=\Phi(S_1)$ , [1] meaning that

$$(1 + \frac{1}{10})x + 6y = K - 12$$
$$(1 + \frac{1}{10})x + y = K - 2$$

[2] We now solve these equations. Taking one away from the other, we obtain 5y=-10, hence y=-2 which gives  $x=\frac{K}{11/10}=\frac{10K}{11}$ . [1]

(c) The value of the contract is

$$V_0^h = x + sy = \frac{10K}{11} - 4$$

[1] at time 0.

(d) The risk-neutral probabilities are

$$q_u = \frac{11/10 - 1/2}{3 - 1/2} = \frac{3/5}{5/2} = \frac{6}{25},$$
$$q_d = \frac{3 - 11/10}{3 - 1/2} = \frac{19/10}{5/2} = \frac{19}{25}.$$

[1] This gives us

$$\frac{1}{1+r} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\Phi(S_1)] = \frac{1}{11/10} \left( \frac{6}{25} (K - 12) + \frac{19}{25} (K - 2) \right)$$
$$= \frac{10}{11} \left( K - \frac{110}{25} \right)$$
$$= \frac{10K}{11} - 4,$$

[2] which is equal to the value of  $V_0^h$  that we found in (c).

(e) The contract is worth zero at time 0 if  $\frac{10}{11}K - 4 = 0$ , that is if  $K = \frac{22}{5}$ . [1]

3